America's Only Monthly Revisionist Newsletter

Smith's Report

ON THE HOLOCAUST CONTROVERSY

Number 82 WWW.CODOH.COM July 2001

NOTEBOOK

Bradley R. Smith

The very savvy journalist, Christopher Hitchens, has published a book titled *The Trial of Henry Kissinger*. He'd like to see the former secretary of state tried for war crimes going back to Vietnam but including much else. Works for me.

Kissinger, too, has a book out. It's called *Does America Need a Foreign Policy*? Because he is promoting his book, he has been asked on at least two occasions what he makes of Hitchens. On both "The News with Brian Williams" and "The Mitch Albom Show," Kissinger called Hitchens a Holocaust denier. "He's a man who has attacked Mother Teresa, Jackie Kennedy, has said the Holocaust never existed," Kissinger told Williams.

As Richard Cohen notes in The Washington Post (26 June), the charge of Holocaust denial is "probably the most odious charge that can be brought against anyone, particularly a writer. In some odd way, it exceeds even 'anti-Semite' since it suggests a kind of complicity in the crime itself: the cover-up. Holocaust denial by the sane—a distinction worth noting here—is coldly malicious, one last

Continued on page 5

AN ENGLISHMAN IN LONDON A JEW IN POLAND & EXTREAMISM IN AMERICA

George Brewer

In recent months the efforts of CODOH and Holocaust revisionism generally have been rewarded in a variety of ways and from a number of surprising sources. A British historian in a London courtroom, a courageous American Jew in a Warsaw newspaper, and the ADL in another one of its silly promotional stunts, have all contributed to a growing awareness of the aims and the content of revisionism. The view from here is that things are changing almost faster than we can describe them, and, while it may take some time for the results to be clear, CODOH continues to lead the way.

AN ENGLISHMAN IN LONDON

As we recall, the British historian David Irving sued Deborah Lipstadt for a number of defamatory comments she made about him in her book, *Denying the Holocaust*. In last year's memorable trial, which Irving unfortunately lost, he was able in the course of his defense to present a number of revisionist arguments, which then became part of the permanent public record.

In June of this year, Irving was again back in court, this time attempting to make an appeal to three judges to allow for a full appeal of the adverse judgment. Over the course of several days, Irving's barrister, Adrian Davies, presented the meat of Irving's appeal, not

Continued on page 3

LETTERS

I look forward to your observations regarding Smith's Report *and the issues it addresses. I read everything you write. Oftentimes it influences how I handle the work. Unfortunately, I cannot reply to correspondence. Not enough hours in the day. I have space to print a very small number of your letters. If you do not want your name published in* **SR**, *please make that plain. Thanks.*

I spoke with a distinguished psychologist about the ADL's labeling of you as an "extremist." This man's beat is political psychology and radical groups. He has done important work for government agencies, like the CIA. His name must remain anonymous.

He told me that you should view the ADL's labeling of you an "extremist" as a "backhanded compliment." He said the ADL monitor's "enemy" publications very closely, and they only attack individuals and/or a group when they become "powerful or influential." The ADL must feel that CODOH and *The Revisionist* are "gaining a large audience," so they labeled you an "extremist" in an attempt to discredit you. You will have noticed that all other revisionist groups and individuals were either ignored or mentioned only in passing. And by the way, he said he agrees with my article about you, and he said there are many more people in government which would probably also agree with us—"in private."

Paul Grubach

[*If you would like to read the ADL screed on Bradley Smith and Extremism in America (3,100 words) and Paul Grubach's response (2,200 words) published in* **The Revisionist**, *I'll send them along in return for a donation.*]

Today's Asbury Park Press has run a story entitled: "Pope condemns Nazi massacres: Pontiff to visit Babi Yar, site of atrocity." The most interesting aspect of the text is its statistics. All of the following passages are in this one article (6/25/01).

"The pope made his comments on the eve of a visit to Babi Yar, a ravine where tens of thousands of Jews and others were killed and buried in mass graves during the World War II Nazi occupation of Ukraine."

"Here in Kiev, at Babi Yar, during the Nazi occupation, countless people, including over 100,000 Jews, were killed over a few days."

"More than 33,000 Jews were killed over just two days. Altogether, between 100,000 and 200,000 people including non-Jews are believed to have been killed at Babi Yar."

It appears that the editor will accept anything and everything on the subject.

D.H., New Jersey

Maybe the Asbury Park Press *does not have an editor and everyone there is just winging it. I have a news clipping in my files where a U.S. reporter visiting Kiev is told by his Russian taxi driver (a photograph of the "taxista" accompanies the article) that it is well known among the locals that some "12,000" victims were killed at Babi Yar.*

Good to see you reading Chinese poetry. My kind of guy. I read sacred literature or ancient literature to relax. Turned my son on to Gilgamesh and the Flood, tried to turn him on to Assyrian cuneiform. Myself I prefer to read old Zoroastrian, Hindu, Buddhist or Taoist texts. I have a great text from the Tao I'd like to use, it seems very apt for the Polish-Jewish and even German-Jewish fights always going on. It's adapted from Lin Yutang's translation of Lao Tse:

> Patching up a great hatred is sure to leave some hatred behind.
>
> How can this be regarded as satisfactory?
>
> Therefore, the sage holds the debtor's portion, and does not put the guilt on the other party.
>
> The virtuous man is for patching up, The vicious is for fixing guilt. (...)

Ralph Marquardt, NY

Good poem. I'm no one to give advice about raising children, as everyone who reads this newsletter knows by now, but Assyrian cuneiform? – give the kid a break..

By coincidence, I received a note from Robert Faurisson who told me "Bradley, no one (I repeat, no one) knows how to raise a child." *I had never heard such a thought expressed before. It took a while, but I began to see what is implied. At bottom, no one can know who his child is, just as at bottom, the wife, the mother, the friend remains unknown. I have been trying all my life to understand who I am and I don't think I am very close to finding out. There is a great mystery here, one that the religious personality and now the shrinks and the scientists are trying to find an answer to. Nevertheless, it's clear that some of us do better with ourselves than others do, and some of us do better with our wives and children than others do.*

Your efforts to educate college students with regard to the facts of the "holocaust" are much commended. However! You're abilities as a businessman are lousy! I don't recall when I first subscribed to your newsletter, but I do know that you have never notified me that my subscription should have lapsed – a long time ago. How can you maintain an income if you don't keep track of when subs should be renewed?

I have no idea how many renewals I owe you, but I am enclosing a little something that will, hopefully, cover all the unrenewed renewals. I do not ask to renew my sub because I am damn near broke supporting others (David Irving for one) and do not have the wherewithal to continue with Smith's Report. Get hot on the business end of your affairs!

Frank E. Elwell.

I'm aware that I'm not a good businessman because people who wish me well keep telling me I am not. Anyhow, thanks for the check, which takes care of the sub to **SR** *for the last several years. I can't drop you now. I wouldn't feel right. You're on the gift list for the foreseeable future.*

Continued from page 1

only as it pertained to the overall judgment, but particularly with regard to revisionist claims about Auschwitz. Although the outlook was and remains pessimistic, there was a certain amount of surprise, when, after the presentation, the judges announced that they would reserve judgment for a matter of weeks. In a sense, this could be counted a victory for Irving since it meant that his arguments had enough merit to deserve careful review.

Of course, the final decision of the judges will be important in more ways than one. In the first place, if he fails, Irving will be saddled with the exorbitant costs racked up by Lipstadt and her defenders, quoted as high as six million dollars by some. But it must also be confessed that a negative finding against Irving will also affect revisionism, because it will mean, at least implicitly, that the establishment has once more chosen to ignore the findings of revisionism or give them any legitimacy, even as a minority viewpoint. Everyone has to be prepared for such negative effects.

At the same time, whatever the judges find, we feel there is plenty of room for optimism. Irving's trial, the appeal, and the material prepared for the appeal, have brought into the open a large amount of material and documentation that has been accumulated by revisionists like Germar Rudolf, Carlo Mattogno and CODOH's own Samuel Crowell over the past ten years, and this material is not only easily accessible on the Internet via CODOHWeb but can also now be safely discussed by just about everyone because it was debated in the widely reported trial.

To be sure, the few books that have emerged from the trial so far have consisted of the usual defense mechanisms for the exterminationist point of view. But even these have had to mention, even as they have avoided, the arguments of Rassinier, Butz, Faurisson, Staeglich, and Leuchter. It may be that in the short term, highly paid Holocaust experts like Robert Jan Van Pelt will continue to avoid such materials. But other interested students or scholars will have an entrée, thanks to the Irving trial, to study and discuss this data in their own papers, articles, and books. We are confident that eventually they will do so.

Twenty-five years ago, to mention revisionist views was difficult, because it carried with it the suggestion that the person mentioning them was a reader of forbidden literature. But today, and largely thanks to the courage and willingness of David Irving to confront the facts about Auschwitz, anyone can discuss the issues about the Auschwitz camp or the Holocaust in general simply by referencing the newspaper or books written about this famous trial. The effects may be long in coming, but the taboo has finally been broken.

A JEW IN POLAND

Another factor that is ultimately helpful to revisionism, in setting aside the falsehoods and myths of World War Two, comes from an unlikely quarter: debates in today's Poland concerning Poland's responsibility for the persecution of its Jewish citizens.

The debate began last year when Jan Gross, a Polish-Jewish expatriate in New York, published a book entitled *Neighbors,* which attempted to argue that the Poles had a long tradition of anti-Semitism that they needed to face up to, and that Poland's sad history in the 20th Century, involving among other things over 50 years of communist repression, was not something that could be blamed on its Jewish minority. The centerpiece of Gross's argument was an alleged massacre that took place in the village of Jedwabne in July, 1941, in which, Gross claimed, the Polish inhabitants of the town spontaneously rose up and murdered hundreds of their Jewish neighbors.

It goes without saying that the charge, not very well supported by evidence, outraged most patriotic Poles. But it was the sequel to Gross's book that was most damaging, because, not long after his book was published in the United States in English, Gross published another piece in a Polish newspaper, entitled Mrs. Marx's Pillow, which argued that Poland should be willing to return to its former Jewish citizens the property they lost in World War Two, since after all, it amounted only to such things as random household furnishings, i.e., such as Mrs. Marx's Pillow.

This was enough to galvanize Norman Finkelstein, a political science professor in New York, and well known to revisionists as the author of *A Nation on Trial* and *The Holocaust Industry*. In an Op-ed piece published in a competing Warsaw daily, Finkelstein called Gross's book, Goldhagen for Beginners, and was particularly scathing with the idea that the Poles were merely being asked to make token redress. As he wrote, "(...) the Holocaust industry doesn't merely want back "Mrs. Marx's pillow": it wants her whole house - and more."

Finkelstein then took the opportunity to launch into another blistering attack on the Holocaust Industry, which he initially defined as those individuals and institutions exploiting the Jewish genocide during World War II for political and financial gain but which he soon called an "extortion racket wrapped in the mantle of Jewish suffering," a "shakedown," and "Holocaust hooliganism, plain and simple." It is invigorating to read such a frank appraisal of the exploitation of the Holocaust, and, it must be said, it is encouraging that it is coming from a Jewish intellectual: it reminds us that the ultimate success of Holocaust revisionism depends on thoughtful and courageous people of all kinds.

Of course, Finkelstein would bridle at being characterized as a revisionist. Certainly in terms of the definition that our opponents have created for us he couldn't be, since Finkelstein has not shown any desire to question any of the facts of the Jewish destruction in World War Two. At the same time, the revisionist critique of the Holocaust has always gone hand in hand with a critique of its exploitation: the sooner the exploitation is exposed, the sooner we can get back to the real work of scholarship. Therefore, to the extent that Finkelstein's powerful

writings shake up the Holocaust establishment, to that extent revisionist aims are being served.

The flap over *Neighbors* also serves to indicate the extent to which the Holocaust is being used by increasingly narrow interests. For many years, the Holocaust was used to include nameless millions of non-Jews, also supposedly exterminated by the Nazis. As such, the Holocaust was also an important element in Polish national memory. But Gross's book, along with the recent theft by Yad Vashem of some paintings by the important Polish author Bruno Schulz, has gone a long way to make it clear to Poles what has long been clear to most everyone else: the Holocaust is used by Jewish individuals and some Jewish institutions to serve themselves, and no one else need apply. Thus, another audience of some 40 million Poles has been created for revisionist outreach.

EXTREMISM IN AMERICA

Of course, one of the main groups in the vanguard of manipulating the Holocaust for their own gain is the Anti-Defamation League. For many years, they have stridently complained about Bradley Smith, the Campus Project, and CODOH's Internet presence. Hot on the heels of such gimmicks as "Hate Hurts" and the ADL "Hate Filters," the ADL has recently published a new pamphlet, entitled Extremism in America& in which Bradley Smith and CODOH figure prominently.

While it's difficult to take the pamphlet seriously, it is also difficult to decide what one's reaction should be. On the one hand, the booklet is sure to inspire anger, because it lumps Bradley Smith in with a number of individuals who have advocated violence and vandalism, some of whom have even been convicted of such crimes. Bearing in mind that neither Smith nor CODOH has ever advocated violence, or racism, but only peaceful dialogue and discussion, it is simply slanderous that Smith was even included in the booklet at all. On the other hand, Smith and CODOH are the only Holocaust revisionists who are given more than passing mention: in fact, the ADL's slanted biography of Smith's revisionist career runs to over 3,000 words.

The fact that the Anti-Defamation League has sought to tie in the provocative and careful historical analysis and easygoing truth seeking of Bradley Smith and CODOH with bona fide extremists should be a cause for a certain amount of pride. After all, the ADL would not have included CODOH were it not for the fact that CODOH's tactics have been successful in acquainting all interested people, not just college students, to the more accurate revisionist alternative to World War Two history. By lumping an apolitical group, together with others, some of which are avowedly a threat to the political order to the United States, only goes to show that while CODOH is no threat to America, it is a threat to the interests of the ADL and to those private individuals who bankroll it.

On the other hand, there is a more sinister aspect to the ADL's pamphlet. The only specific and rather feeble attack that the ADL was able to make on Smith himself consisted of a quote concerning Christian acquiescence to the promotion of Jewish interests. Closer examination finds that references to Christian symbolism is a prominent part of the descriptions for all of the extremist groups mentioned, even though Christianity as such has little if anything to do with the activities of most of the groups. Sad to say, it appears that the ADL, in its fight against bigotry, has adopted bigotry: for nothing shines through more clearly from Extremism in America than a thinly veiled and simmering hatred of Christianity itself.

CONCLUSION

The summer of 2001 may be remembered as a time when revisionism finally began to find its legs, but the situation remains volatile in more ways than one. Due to the personal courage of such diverse personalities as David Irving and Norman Finkelstein, the two key elements of classical Holocaust revisionism, the criticism of the facts and the exploitation of the Jewish tragedy, have now been thrust fully into the mainstream of intellectual life in the West. At the same time, the importance of revisionism itself is attested by the inclusion of CODOH in the ADL's obnoxious booklet.

Now is the time to proceed with magnanimity and care. On the one hand, revisionism needs to be receptive to the input from non-revisionists, including Jews, who may be interested in some aspects of revisionism, but not in others. This requires building bridges outside of the revisionist community, and also requires a willingness to accept the fact that, while the current Holocaust story is riddled with errors, the Jewish people need, from revisionists themselves, a sincere acknowledgement of their losses in a general sense.

Above all, there is a need in this changing situation to be ever vigilant for excessive reactions from either side as the ideas of Holocaust revisionism are mainstreamed. While there is a greater need for polemical writings -- opinion pieces, magazine and newspaper articles and such-- than before, we should be careful to temper our views. The goal of Holocaust revisionism, after all, is truth, reconciliation and dialogue, not destabilization, manufactured hatred, or censorship. If anything, those are the goals of the other side.

Now is the time for revisionists to follow through on the renewed interest in revisionist writings by continuing our search for new documents, correcting errors or lapses in previous work, maintaining revisionist outreach through the Internet and other media, and opening doors for dialogue. Bradley and CODOH are clearly major players in this effort, and outreach is where we have always excelled, and will continue to excel, with your continued support.

INTERNET ROUNDUP

The Revisionist E-Zine accessed One Million times

Richard Widmann

Readers of ***Smith's Report*** are probably familiar with CODOH's print magazine ***The Revisionist***. Conceived in the summer of 1999, *The Revisionist* was printed in large runs to be distributed on college campuses across the United States. As part of the Campus Project for the 1999-2000 school year, Bradley decided to provide college students and their professors with more revisionism than they had ever seen before. Each issue was packed with 24 pages of revisionist scholarship, reviews and commentary. The first three issues of *The Revisionist* made quite a ruckus. At St. Cloud University (MN), for example, the University Chronicle featured a photograph of an hysterical lady professor burning *The Revisionist* at an outdoor rally.

By the summer of 2000 financial support for *The Revisionist* was not what we had hoped for. Campus papers with large distribution could easily snap up 10,000 copies of an issue. At San Diego State U, for example, the Daily Aztec alone distributed 15,000 copies of issue No.3. Even our large print runs became a drop in the bucket to what could actually be distributed. These challenges resulted in a new strategy, and issue No.4, though completed, was not printed.

In September of 2000, Bradley announced (see **SR72**) that we would make *The Revisionist* an on-line magazine. The Revisionist E-Zine (Electronic Magazine) was born. We established a second Webpage,< codoh.org >, that would feature *The Revisionist* while our flagship Webpage < codoh.com > would continue to house the world's largest archive of revisionist materials. The E-Zine could be produced for a fraction of the cost of the print magazine, and it could be distributed to an infinite number of people on campus and off. The Campus Project could now be dubbed the World Project!

Throughout the 2000-01 school year CODOH published smaller ads that promoted *The Revisionist* Website. The new strategy was apparently viewed as a defeat by the watchdogs that run the Anti-Defamation League. In their recent article, "Extremism in America," they gave Bradley "special treatment" and specifically targeted *The Revisionist* and its editorial staff. The ADL wrote that The *Revisionist* was "defunct."

Far from being defunct, *The Revisionist* emerged from cyberspace as a stealth jet emerges from the heavens. Besides reprinting most of the contents of the print issues, *The Revisionist* is on to its fifth issue of brand new material on-line. As of July 5, 2001, our E-Zine was accessed for the one-millionth time! We could never have had such a large readership with our print magazine.

The breadth of revisionist scholarship is amazing. Readers have been exposed to new works by leading revisionists including: Joseph Bellinger, Friedrich Berg, George Brewer, Samuel Crowell, Robert Faurisson, Matt Giwer, Paul Grubach, William Halvorsen, Mackenzie Paine, Orest Slepokura, Bradley Smith, and John Weir.

In a single-day recently *The Revisionist* was accessed over 50,000 times. *The Revisionist* clearly owes its success to truth and technology. There is no doubt that *The Revisionist* is encouraging debate on the Holocaust question and correcting the historical record among more people than could ever have been hoped for only one year ago.

Your support makes possible projects like *The Revisionist* E-Zine, the first and only Holocaust revisionist magazine on the Internet and the World Wide Web.

NOTEBOOK

kick at the survivors themselves, one last attempt to say they don't matter. It is cruel beyond words."

But why is Hitchens a Holocaust denier? In 1996 he argued in Vanity Fair that St Martin's Press had behaved contemptibly by unilaterally breaking its contract to publish David Irving's *Goebbels*. He even thought it was a pretty good book. In Richard Cohen's view Kissinger has attempted to silence a critic by, in effect, "questioning his sanity."

I've done a lot more defending of revisionism than Christopher Hitchens has but I don't think I have ever been charged with being insane. The charge of insanity is reserved for those writers who have a substantial income. They can hire lawyers to defend themselves. They can plead it's not their fault, that they're crazy. It's not so easy when you are charged only with being "coldly malicious." Where's the defense against that? There's nothing in it for the lawyers.

The Evanston Public Library used to shelve Arthur Butz's *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. A curious soul, wondering if it still does, looked for it in the EPL catalog via the Internet. Yes, it's still there. It is now

listed as an "adult book," which usually means that children under eighteen can not get their hands on it. So Evanston high school kids are protected from the *Hoax*, but once they're unfortunate as to be old enough to go to college, they're on their own.

Holocaust denial is finding increasing acceptance in certain Arab circles as part of their anti-Israel propaganda, according to a feature story in The Jerusalem Post (14 June). Such "circles" exist in most every Arab country I could name, and it goes beyond Arab countries to Muslim states in general. This is very troubling to the Holocaust Industry, as their spokesmen are pointing out to us with an increasing enthusiasm.

Deborah Lipstadt thinks the Arabs are dumb, but we would expect that from this deeply religious personality: "It shows the depth of their [Arab] anti-Semitism and their hatred of the Jews, and the depth to which their hatred overcomes their logic." Moreover, arguing against Holocaust facts "also shows their tactical stupidity. (…) What makes them do it? Either their hatred of Jews overrides everything else, or there is a disconnect -- the people who are doing it are not thinking tactically."

For Lipstadt serious protests against revisionism must first come from the US. "'What we should be hearing from our State Department, as much as it's going to be involved, is: 'you want confidence builders? OK, we're not going to talk about withdrawal, we're not talking about putting down arms. But [H. revisionism]? This is certainly not a 'confidence builder: this is a confidence-shatterer.'"

The JP then reports that Lipstadt's "fear for the future are Arab students walking around saying they know that there was no Holocaust, because they learned it in their textbooks. 'A colleague of mine said: The bombs last a minute, and they can do terrible damage. But this stuff is an incendiary device that lasts generations.'"

Just so! There are an increasing number of Arab and Muslim circles that are thinking very tactically indeed. More than tactically – strategically. Using words to make their case, not guns. In the end the word will triumph over the gun. Of course, being human, those who win using the word will then turn to the gun to keep what they have won with the word and to overcome those who have not yet learned to use the word effectively. That's how we are.

The latest drama about Anne Frank, the much ballyhooed ABC television miniseries that played the end of May, is remarkable for at least one fact. According to The Washington Times (17 May) "it is not based on the diary…." Rather, it is based on a 1998 book by Melissa Muller, *Anne Frank: The Biography*, and on additional research by its screenwriter and co-producer Kirk Ellis.

Ellis says he "avoided using any direct diary quotes" from the "diary." Ellis views the diary "primarily as a literary work." (Muller's book quotes extensively from Anne's diaries, "both her original version and the version she was amending at the time of her death.") Ellis then observes that Otto Frank himself said that the diary "was a revelation to him because his daughter never spoke this way." That is, the way she wrote. All this takes us back to one of the one of the points Robert Faurisson made about the "Diary" twenty-odd years ago. It's not a "diary." It's a literary work. Therefore, it's not a factual historical document. One more example of radical revisionist work entering mainstream consciousness, with no acknowledgement.

Screenwriter Ellis, after debating the issue with himself, even chose not to use Anne's famous statement, "In spite of everything I still believe that people are really good at heart." Why? Because it is "such a misrepresentation of what happened to her." I can see why this is a sticking point for those who treat the manuscript as an historical document rather than a literary one. The sticking point is that Anne didn't say "Jews" are really good at heart. She didn't mention Englishmen or Dutchmen or Russians or Frenchmen or Hungarians. She wrote "people." That would include Germans. Germans are people today, and they were people when Anne was rewriting her diary. And that is the sticking point on the other end of the equation.

When TV playwright Ellis notes that "Anne's ideas as a writer and as a person were in transition at the time of her arrest," he must be correct. She was a natural writer. She was working on an autobiographical manuscript based on diary notes. That's oftentimes what autobiographical writers do. She was at odds with her father and mother. She was in danger. She was smart. She was feeling sexy. She was growing up. And she may very well have been coming to the very human conclusion that Germans were caught up in the extravagant events of the day just as the Dutch and the Jews were. Ellis believes, in effect, that Anne didn't know what she was talking about. I would like to think she did, because I think she was right. At bottom people really are – good at heart.

Expect every day to be different. Okay. I reported here last month that things were going better with Paloma. That was about when things started going very bad indeed. Three weeks ago we committed her (again) to a no-frills Mexican detoxification center. No frills meaning, for example, that if you want to wash yourself with warm water you have to make a wood fire to heat a bucket of water. The center is on a dirt road at the end of a narrow rocky canyon. I takes about thirty-five minutes to get there traveling at ten, fifteen miles per hour. As you approach the little bowl with the handful of barracks-like buildings you can see the lookouts on the rocks silhouetted against the sky. It makes me think of a 19th century military post in Indian Territory.

This story is cribbed from the June 20 issue of La Voz de Aztlan, a radical Mexican-American newspaper published in Los Angeles.. The paper was rooting for Mexican-American Antonio Villargairosa during the race for Los Angeles mayor. Villargairosa lost to an "anglo."

Meanwhile, La Voz discovered at a press conference that Villargairosa, who has had a formidable career in California state politics, had raised 18 million dollars for the "Jewish 'Museum of Tolerance,'" or, The Simon Wiesenthal Center. He said: "That amount of money is unprecedented in the history of this state. I put the money together because I agree with the Rabbis who work there, Rabbi May, Rabbi Cooper...."

The reporter for La Voz found this to be a "shocking revelation! Eighteen million dollars is a lot of money for a museum with a definite political agenda and a well known 'indoctrination program' involving hundreds of thousands of school children per year from local school districts that are forced to attend at $5.50 per head."

La Voz "thought that rabbis were holy men so we thought nothing of calling [Rabbi Cooper] to ask some questions concerning the 18 million dollars.... On the first call we were informed that Rabbi Cooper was in Washington D.C. and were told to call back three days later. We called back three days later and were informed that the rabbi was unavailable and the Director of Public Relations inquired about the nature of our call. When we explained, things turned ugly. The lady got very defensive and belligerent. She asked us to please wait, pretending that she was attempting to direct our call, but we got the distinct impression that they were attempting to trace our call. She accused us of intimidating and threatening them and when we asked her if she was recording the call she said 'yes'".

"We have since learned that Rabbi Cooper is actually a lobbyist in Washington D.C for the Zionist Movement in America and has spent millions of dollars attempting to pass laws against "freedom of the press" on the Internet. He has testified before the U.S. Senate and wants tighter controls over web sites that question things like La Voz de Aztlan does. This way nobody will have the ability to question things like the 18 million dollars of taxpayer funds given him by Villargairosa.

"Interesting Note: Chief Rabbi Marvin Hier along with his wife draws an annual salary of over $750,000. It looks like the "holocaust" has now become a very lucrative industry for many rabbis."

Not only do the H. Industry people have their hands full with emerging "circles" of uppity Arabs all over the Middle East and North America – but now the Mexicans? But then this is the reaction that the kind of tolerance promoted by The Museum of Tolerance creates. It's odd that they don't really understand this.

Historians Without Borders versus Propagandists Without Morals

Robert H. Countess, Ph.D.

I founded Historians Without Borders [HWB] on March 25, 2001, on the analogy to Physicians Without Borders. Its purpose is to assemble select field teams to make on-site observations, to investigate specific problems in Holocaust and related studies, and to do so without political considerations or political correctness and to apply a scientific approach to historiography

The purpose of this first HWB field trip would be to examine Krema II Leichenkeller I, the alleged Homicidal Gassing Chamber [HGC] which Van Pelt and others allege to be "a Holy of Holies" and wherein up to one million Jews [of course, Jews, since the Holocaust Legend is fanatically fixated on Jewish ethnocentrism!] were gassed with Zyklon B, a very dangerous gaseous agent used for a century in some American States at prisons to put murderers to death.

I attempted to assemble a team that could meet me in Prague, Czech Republic. Prague is an excellent location with a modern airport, the ancient Charles University, charm, hotels and restaurants, and an Autobahn system that is nearly complete to the Polish border some five hours drive by rental car. [I was told in Prague that Ray Kroc, founder of McDonald's, came from a family of Plzen Krocs. If true, then he may be the most famous Czech in the World!]

At Auschwitz there is an eerie silence or, at best, whispering devotees acting in accord with the sign at the entrance that tells visitors to honor the memory of the dead from Hitlerite crimes by maintaining a quiet reverie. Technical details of this first HWB field trip cannot be revealed since the Holo-dogmatists might thus be informed of some of the methods that the HWB Director holds to be vital to solving the Robert Faurisson "No holes? No Holocaust!" controversy once and for all

I found Building F at Birkenau, the large Sauna, open. In 1989--my first visit -- it was closed to the public. Now it has slightly raised glass flooring for tourists and there are signs in the rooms in Polish, English, and Hebrew. In 1989 I crawled through a broken window at the rear of this very important building, took photos of the "dirty side" with the "Eine Laus dein Tod" (One Louse, Your Death) clearly readable. But now, this wall sign has been removed, or painted over, and I am puzzled as to why.

This Sauna could have provided the best facility for mass extermination. Unlike the Kremas, the Sauna possessed all the appearances of a real shower-processing center. There would have been no need for the SS to camouflage the building. It possessed no appearance of killing apparatus. On the other hand, the Kremas, with their chimneys and stacks of coal and coke, were obviously places for the burning of corpses. As such, average people

with at least average intelligence might have panicked and attempted to flee from long queues waiting to enter such a building with its obvious signs of "death."

Even so, in the Sauna there are signs erected for tourists that are sinister in their connotation and promote the idea of an extermination plan. Always and everywhere the tourist must be presented with the mass extermination concept, because without it "Auschwitz" becomes just another concentration camp for forced labor, internees and transit activity for Jews being sent "into the East" [Belarus and Ukraine] to build roads and drain swamps etc.

At the main camp of Auschwitz, I had asked the official tour guide if the swimming pool was part of the tour. He said: "No."

I walked to it and took photos as I did twelve years earlier. Now there is the standard three language sign that describes this pool as a fire reservoir. I mentioned to a Jewish tourist sitting nearby that this was obviously a swimming pool. The man replied that it was only for use in case of a fire. At that remark I looked to my right and then to the left and pointed out to him two red and yellow painted fire hydrants and said: "Those are for fighting a fire."

In order to use the Auschwitz pool for firefighting there would have had to have been large numbers of buckets for a bucket brigade, an ineffective method for putting out a fire in brick and concrete buildings. I might even suggest an analogy to "No holes? No Holocaust!" – "No buckets? No fire-fighting reservoir!"

Historians Without Borders has made a very modest first effort, but it was the first of what will become numerous field trips. Holocaust Studies must continue to focus on actual scientific historiography rather than on dogma, politics and emotion. Interested volunteers are encouraged to apply to the Director, at boblbpinc@earthlink.net for the 2002 field trip.

The Holocaust Question

Ignore the Thought Police.
Read the evidence.
Judge for yourself.

www.codoh.com

This is the "sticker" that I printed while I was in Visalia. It's slightly reduced here to fit in the column. The lettering is black on a bright, glossy yellow background. I thought it was kind of a fun idea and that it would be productive as well. I didn't know how much interest there would be in it. The 3,000 stickers I printed are just about gone – 10, 50, 100 at a time -- so I will print it again.

One way to use the sticker that didn't occur to me, but did to several of you, is to use it to seal the back of the junk mail (postage paid) envelopes you receive in the mail. Costs nothing, and goes through many hands before reaching its final destination. But there are many ways to use it, and it stays where it is put, one advantage it has over a leaflet (I will reprint my leaflet The Holocaust Controversy: the Case for Open Debate, this month.

BUSINESS

In August, as usual, there will be no ***Smith's Report***. With the September issue I plan to change the routine a bit. While I have always mailed **SR** first class, I will mail it bulk rate. While I will realize a small savings in postal costs, that isn't what interests me in the change.

The real advantage is that I will be able to include up to four ounces of material in the envelope rather than one ounce at the same postage rate. I am not planning to increase the pages of **SR**, but if I need more pages for one issue, I will have them. I am not planning to include materials from ***The Online Revisionist***, or the CODOHWeb Discussion Forum with every mailing, but if I want to I will have the ability to do so without paying triple or quadruple the postage.

The disadvantage of mailing via bulk is that it takes longer to be delivered. Nevertheless, most newsletters are mailed bulk. It's been my experience that there will be very few of you who will experience any significant delay in receiving **SR**. I believe the benefits will outweigh any disappointment on that score.

Meanwhile, the Campus Project is about to take a new turn. I hope to have some good news for you here in **SR83**. And I am finally able to update the **SR** Catalog of documents published on CODOHWeb and other revisionist sites that, for the most part, will never be available in print form.

Once again I want to thank you for your continued support. There's no one else.

Bradley

Smith's Report

is produced by
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)

For your contribution of $29 you will receive eleven issues of
Smith's Report
Canada and Mexico $35
Overseas $39

All checks and correspondence to

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Diego, California 92143

Telephone: 619 685 2163

Tel & Fax (Baja):

011 52 661 23984

E-mail: brsmith@telnor.net